

Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. xxv. 10.

VOLUME III.]

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1857.

[NUMBER 2.

The Radical Abolitionist
WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.
Is Published Monthly,
AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.
BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

Terms.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

POLITICAL ECONOMY BEWILDERED.

SUBSTITUTE FOR 'NON-EXTENSIONISM'

FORESHADOWED.

Some of our readers may remember that Mr. H. C. Carey of Philadelphia, some time ago, (1853) published a work entitled, "The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign, why it Exists and how it may be Extinguished."—The writer's definition of slavery was not confined to *chattel* slavery, but included serfdom, poverty, &c. in which he strongly resembled Mr. George Fitzhugh, of Virginia, and other advocates and apologists of American slavery. Mr. Carey's grand remedy for slavery was a high protective tariff which should enhance the price of cotton as well as of cotton fabrics, so as to make slaveholding as profitable as possible, enrich the slaveholders, and raise the price of slaves. Whenever this work should have been sufficiently accomplished, the slave would become too valuable to remain a slave, and would of necessity in the nature of the case, and without any special legislation become a free man. The philosophy and the logic of this process of reasoning we could never comprehend and never met with any one who could. The book was favorably reviewed, however, in the New York Tribune. Some articles in the National Era, from the pen, if we mistake not, of the gifted but eccentric Dr. Elder, also commended the book, and contained some strange statements which we were permitted to controvert, in the same paper, soon after. There the matter rested, and for some time, we heard nothing more of Mr. Carey, or his theory. Soon after the defeat of Fremont we sought occasion to enquire of one of the leading friends of that movement in this city, whether there were not now a prospect of a Republican rally upon a higher platform, one that should not make it "the white man's party" nor look merely to the interests of free white labor in the territories, but strike directly for the liberties of the slaves in the States. Our friend seemed to favor our suggestions, but on reflection replied that no platform would answer that

could not carry Pennsylvania, and the position of Pennsylvania was conditioned upon the approbation of the wealthy and talented Mr. Carey:—and Mr. Carey would not assent to such a platform. Our suggestions for a speedy regeneration of the Republican party must therefore, for the present, be postponed. But we expected to hear nothing more of the wonderful process of emancipation by making slaveholding more profitable, making the slaveholders rich, and doubling the price of the slaves.

We were mistaken. The National Era of August 6th, contains an editorial leader headed "OUR SLAVE SYSTEM," in which the same theory is introduced and descanted upon, at some length. We think it cannot be from the pen of Dr. Baily.* Perhaps it may be from Dr. Elder or from Mr. H. C. Carey himself. It stands as editorial, however, and without signature, in the National Era, and on that journal, for the present, its paternity must rest. Our readers are entitled to some specimens of this singular logic. The article commences with the very just remark that the anxiety of the slaveholders evinces the dangerous symptoms of their cherished system. Were it in a healthful state, it would not need so many physicians. All this is very well. The writer then passes into a train of remark to this point, that social changes are less the result of opinion, will, and volition, than is commonly supposed. They come when circumstances render them inevitable. "Immutable laws of nature and of human life determine them."— "Opinion takes too much credit to itself, when it claims the power, *per se*, to change either a man or a people in their habit of life and action."—There may be a small per centage of truth in this statement, but the writer presses it quite too far when he insinuates, as he seems to do, the comparative inutility of moral means, and gives us to understand that pecuniary economies, calculations, and appliances, are chiefly to be relied upon, for human elevation and enfranchisement. Thus prepared, the writer launches forth into his theory: thus

"There is nothing in the past success and growth of the slave interest, nothing in its present zeal and adventurous daring, which can raise a fair presumption of its continuance and extension. Slaves in 1776 were not worth in the average more than fifty dollars a head: now it would be safe to value them at four or five hundred. The interest of the owners in this property has enhanced in this proportion, but their hold upon it has lessened just as much. When men are worth nothing or next to nothing to their owners, they are worth as little to themselves, and worthy of as little for themselves. They cannot then be emancipated in reality, because they have not the qualities and capabilities of freemen; and what they are not in themselves they cannot be made by any authority."

According to this logic, the slave system

*The Editor of the Era has, since, alluded to his absence from home, with acknowledgments of the services of the 'able contributor to his editorial pages.'

must have stood strong and vigorous in 1776, the slaveholders must have a firm hold upon their system, and that too, because their slaves were worth little or nothing to them! There were difficulties in the way of their emancipation which it was then deemed impossible to overcome! Nobody then, anticipated any such thing as the abolition of slavery. But the invention of Whitney's cotton gin, some time after, enhanced the value of cotton, of slave labor, and of slaves, in consequence of which the master's hold on the slave has lessened. For this correction of our annals, the historical societies should tender the writer a vote of thanks. That our readers may be sure that we do not misstate the writer's positions we quote further, beginning where we closed.

"To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath." But when a man is really and availably up to the value of a freeman to anybody, he is virtually free from bondage, for nobody can then afford to own him. Suppose a slave's labor worth two dollars a day, nett profit; this would put the principal up to ten thousand dollars. Cultivate him up to this worth, and his master would quickly change the interest and insurance into wages, and let him take the risks himself. Every degree of approach to this high appraisement is an equal approach to emancipation, as a mere policy of business. In a prosperous state of things, competition obliges every owner to enhance the value of his slaves to the utmost; in doing so, he is but lifting them toward the point at which he can no longer hold them. The account of profit and loss settles it at last in favor of the true policy."

That is to say, the more profitable slave labor becomes, and the higher the price of slaves rises in consequence, and the richer the slaveholder becomes by the process, the more certainly will he discover that "the true policy" of money making requires him to give up slave holding entirely, the very process by which he has become enriched! How or why this is, we are not told. We must take it on the faith of "political economy"—on the authority of the writer, whoever he may be, or of Mr. H. C. Carey, whose reputation as a political economist is an axiom with all the remaining advocates of a high protective tariff. We quote farther.

"But besides the logic of the ledger, there is another process in full play all the while, which of itself must tend to the same issue. While a man is but little above the brute in those conditions which are required in the life of society, all there is in him and of him may be bought and sold in the market; but so soon as his higher qualities are put into requisition, they must be cultivated, and then they must be consulted and respected, for they are not the subjects of force: they must be educated by motives adapted to their nature. Here, then, is freedom already, in despite of the provisions of the municipal law, and independent of the words in the bill of sale and the intentions of the contracting parties. To prevent this growth, the man must be kept in conditions of a mere animal—he must not be worth more than fifty dollars to anybody. That is the price of his body, and

the animal instincts which engineer it; the price of his mind, of his hopes and aspirations, of his skill, discretion, and ambitious endeavors, runs up into the thousands indefinitely; and he mounts, while they are working in him, up toward the altitude of freedom."

This argument is properly distinguished from "the logic of the ledger," and has some little resemblance to truth. Whatever tends to educate the slave, tends to foster his aspirations for freedom, and to put means in his hands for attaining it. A certain kind and degree of education grows out of skilful labor, and if the condition of slavery permitted 'the higher qualities' of the man, to be 'educed by motives adapted to his nature,' the progress towards freedom, might be secured. But how is this to be done without wages? And how can wages be paid to a chattel? The chattel system must first be abandoned,—slavery, in other words, must be first abolished, before the process can be commenced, by which, the slave can avail himself of the writer's process of 'working up toward the altitude of freedom.'—He must first be free.

The science of 'political economy' thus applied to the slavery question, pre-supposes the end to be first reached, and then offers to use that end as a measure of securing itself. In rustic parlance, it is 'putting the cart before the horse.' Or, as some one said of the perpetual motion; 'it is the science of lifting one's self up by the waistband of his own breeches.'

We begin to see, now, what the writer meant by disparaging *moral and political* means as the chief instruments of abolishing slavery. The first great work, in his view, is to make the slaveholders rich by the increased profits of slave labor. Emancipation will then follow, of course. We quote still further—

"It is well. We need not insidiously resist the prosperity of the master, we must not oppose the enhancement of the slave's value, and we should not fear the influence of their joint and inseparable prosperity. Poverty is itself bondage, and a poor master makes the poorest and most hopeless slave. The difference between the wife of a millionaire and of a Californian Indian is just the difference between the wealth of their husbands. The savage must be made a gentleman before his squaw can be a lady. Land and labor, all the land and all the labor, of the slave States, must be as high priced, or near it, as in the free, before their chattel slavery will entirely give way under the operations of those causes which permanently and perfectly settle the order of communities.* If the Southern States were reduced to half their present value, if the masters were impoverished and paralyzed, the slaves would lose their culture and discipline, and sink below the possibility of redemption. Their chance here would be no better than in the wilds of Africa. There, not men, but human animals, are in demand; here, the demand is every day growing for more and more of the latent manhood in the animal. There is really a dumb oracle in the vanity of the man that he has brought a hundred dollars more under the hammer than 'the boy' that stood beside him. It is his acquired skill, piety, and intelligence, that have made the difference in his price and in him, and he is that much nearer the day of redemption. Aye, hideous as the thought is in one aspect, it is hopeful in another—that the woman who is sold for her grace and beauty, is, in the order of things, just so much the nearer, as she is more lovely, to that rank in feminine excellence which cannot be valued, and is never purchased."

* Mr. H. C. Carey, in his book, already mentioned, says—"It is not slavery that produces exhaustion of soil, but exhaustion of soil that causes slavery to continue," p. 105. And in answer to an English Journal that had attributed the exhaustion of the soil of the Southern States, to slavery, Mr. Carey says—"Unhappily for this reasoning precisely the same exhaustion is visible in the Northern States," p. 103, and instances the State of New York, p. 104, particularly Dutchess County, p. 105, quoted from the Patent Office Report of 1849.—Singular statements these! Mr. Carey had learned the decrease of the crop of wheat, but had not learned the quadrupled value of the products of that region, in wool, and fat cattle.

Wealth then, no matter by what iniquitous process obtained, is the grand regenerator of human society, after all Decalogues, Golden Rules, Sermons on the Mount, Declarations of self-evident truths, Anti-Slavery Lectures, Societies, agitations, ecclesiastical action, religious teaching, ballot-boxes, statutes, judicial decisions, these may all stand aside, at least for the present, while 'the wealthy and talented Mr. H. C. Carey of Philadelphia' prescribes. The recipe is, give us a protective tariff that shall sufficiently enhance the price of cotton and the price of slaves. Give us plenty of Southern Commercial conventions, which, with the help and advice of Mr. Carey, shall raise the price of labor and of land in the slave States, as high, or nearly as high as in the free States, and then, after all this (alas! for the probable lapse of ages!) chattel slavery will assuredly give way. So says Mr. H. C. Carey, and, certainly the wealthy and talented gentleman must know. 'Aye, hideous as may be the thought, in one aspect,' that Christian fathers and reverenced statesmen and jurists should sell their own daughters for the libertine's harem, never mind. 'It is well.'—'Let us not misunderstand Providence. The work goes bravely on.' The higher the price of the lovely young female, for the seraglio, the surer and the sooner will she rise to dignity of woman! We quote farther:

"Let us not misunderstand or quarrel with Providence. The work goes bravely on. Slaves are worth ten times more in this year of grace, than they were a lifetime ago. In another equal period, they will be worth their own ownership; and when they claim it on this ground, there will be nobody to dispute it with them. Ten years ago, there were thousands of Irishmen who could not have sold themselves in the city of Dublin for sixpence a piece; now, the revived prosperity of the country makes them worth an English shilling a day, and the increase of their wages indicates that prosperity, and gives them hope in proportion."

"This theory disposes of all the difficulties of color, and caste; it puts the question out of the reach of opinion, prejudice, and pride. It explains the progress of the races of men which have risen from barbarism into civilisation, and takes the danger out of all prosperous oppressions. It makes it simply impossible to break the partnership of men in community in the general good or ill of their fortunes. Let Virginia double the productive value of her industry, the price of her lands, and the value of her negroes, as quickly as possible. To do this, she must diversify her avocations, put skill into the muscles and intelligence into the brains of her slaves; and when that process of education is well accomplished, they will be working and thinking for themselves.

The agitation of the South now proclaims this apprehension, whether she understands its inevitability or not. That she does not understand it, is proved by the agitation; for it will not come till it must in the order of things, and then it will not hurt her."

According to the antiquated dogma, 'godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.' But according to the modern improved theory of political economy, the profitableness of iniquity will work out the ends of godliness much better and surer than even godliness itself.

Doctor Cheever may quit preaching, and the Hebrew prophets may be laid aside. The terrible denunciation of Christ against oppressors in the twenty-third and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, and of James in his Epistle, may all be put on the shelf. Instead of saying 'Execute judgment'—'Deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor'—'Break every yoke—Let the oppressed go free'—'Wo to him that useth his

neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work,' we may now say to the slaveholders and to the Nation—Do nothing of the kind—'It is well,' 'The work goes bravely on.'—Instead of saying 'Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you,'—'The hire of your laborers who have reaped down your fields and which is of you kept back by fraud crieth'—we should rather say 'Get rich as fast as you can, on the fruits of unpaid labor, or any way you please, and all will come out right, in the end.' To this very point, we quote from the Editorial in the *National Era*, once more.

"To the South, therefore, we say, in good earnest, Go ahead; take good care of yourselves: get rich the quickest and best way you can invent. Don't bother your brains with questions ethical, ethnological, or theological, catch the spirit of civilised progress; don't allow yourselves to be kept raising raw material and raw negroes for foreign markets. Low styles of labor yield no profits. Raise yours as fast as you can to the level of Christendom's work; manufacture your cotton and iron into the costliest fabrics, and your slaves into the skillfulest laborers. Get even with other white people, and with respectable nations: bridge your streams; turnpike your wagon roads; iron your thoroughfares; induce labor-saving machinery; make a stupid negro worth nothing; make a mere slave a nuisance, and a lazy white man an emigrant; make your own boots, books, and Bostons. Quit making nationalities out of Southernisms, and fools and martyrs of Northern Democrats, and send Douglas, Toombs, Mason, Davis, and Keitt, to Coventry; for as sure as you stick to patriarchalism, foreign trade, and hog and hominy, ten years more, Henry A. Wise will turn Abolitionist with an eye to the Presidency, and Robert J. Walker will be down on you, with the Point of Nebraska bill in your bowels; and all the nonsense of the last twenty years of strict construction of the Constitution will by its back stroke be the death of you."

Yes! do all this, and in doing, 'don't bother your brains' about the will or the commands of your Creator—go on and prosper, in utter forgetfulness and contempt of Him, and of his laws. Get the products of industry out of slave labor, the benefits of obeying God's laws out of a course of defiant disobedience to them all—do all this—aye—do it—let us see it DONE—and then turn the folly of your soothsayers into wisdom by the process; do all this, and when it is done, you shall undoubtedly get the abolition of slavery in the way pointed out by the writer of the editorial in the *National Era*!

Passing strange is it that a writer on political economy, past the middle of this nineteenth century of the Christian Era, with one foot, as it were, in the free, and the other in the slave States, and in the habit of gathering the statistics of each, should dream of such a thing as raising the price of land and labor in the slave State, very nearly or quite equal to those of the free states, without a previous abolition of slavery. Stranger still is it that he should imagine that such a miracle, when wrought, is adapted to convince the slaveholder, the nation, and its law-givers, of the unprofitableness and bad policy of the slave system, and the necessity of employing free labor.

But the high price of slaves, he imagines, would render it impossible to own them. How so, if, as his supposition implies, the profitableness of owning them is in proportion to their value, so that the latter comes through the former? If my increased skill in raising crops should raise the price of my land from \$5 to \$50, would that make it impossible for me to own the land? If our merchant shipping could

be so profitably employed as to quadruple the value of the ships, would that make it impossible for our merchants to own them? If horses could be so profitably employed that their average price should rise from \$100 to \$1000, would that put a stop to the ownership of horses? Does 'the logic of the ledger' prove any such thing?

But 'when they shall be worth their own ownership,' says the writer in the National Era, 'and when they shall claim it on this ground, there will be none to dispute it with them.'

Is this so? Where is the slave that is not worth his own ownership—not worth himself to himself? Not worth more to himself than he can possibly be to another? And when does a slaveholder ever cease to dispute with his slave his own right to himself, for the reason that he was an uncommonly valuable slave? Who does not know that the chances of a slave's emancipation are always in an inverse ratio to his market value? Who does not know that when a valuable slave asks to purchase himself, or when his friends desire to purchase, in order to manumit him, the answer always intimates that, on account of his uncommon value, the master is loth to part with him? Who does not know that many of the slaves of the Greeks and Romans, taken captives in war, were men of genius, learning and refinement, and that their superior value on this account rendered their redemption the more difficult?

The inverted logic of the writer is every where apparent. His theory requires, for its verification by existing facts, that the shareholders of the present day, when the average price of slaves, as says this writer, is \$400 or \$500 a head, instead of \$50, as in 1776, should be much less resolutely bent on maintaining slavery in 1857 than they were in 1776. The exact reverse of this, everybody knows to be the fact. At the former period, slavery was decried among them, by almost universal consent. It is now almost as universally cherished.

But the slave system, he maintains, is now in a diseased state. The nurses and the doctors are working anxiously to keep it alive. It is already in a dying condition. And this he attributes, *not* to the moral, religious, and political agitations against slavery, but to the fact that slavery is now so much more profitable than formerly, and the slaves command so much higher price! Slavery maintains in this country, a dubious and precarious foothold, he thinks, *not* because the moral sentiment and enlightened conscience, and living religion of the community is coming to be arrayed against it, not because the agitations of abolitionists have turned the eyes and the fingers of the civilized world toward it and against it; not because the forcible capture of fugitive slaves is now resisted, and rouses the public indignation; not because the admission of new slave states is opposed; not because Congress is asked to exclude the abomination from the territories, to abolish it in the Federal District, to stop the traffic in slaves between the states, not because issues of this character are carried into national politics, and breaking up old political parties; not because a portion of the slaveholders and a portion of the abolitionists are calling for a dissolution of the Union, not because other abolitionists are

demanding a National Abolition of Slavery in the States, to the terror and consternation of the President and both houses of Congress, as evinced by his Message, and by their discussions, accusations and disclaimers, during an entire session; not because the controversy convulses religious bodies, divides sects, and threatens still further divisions; not because the conflicting interests of freedom and slavery are embroiling Kansas, and threatening a civil war, not because the echo of these conflicts have half roused the slaves to resistance; not because the non-slave holding whites of the slave states are beginning to demand their just rights. In all these varied manifestations, springing into life, during the last twenty-five years, from the one sole source of moral, religious and political 'opinion' and agitation, which this writer regards as destitute of power 'to change either a man or a people in their habits of life and action,' he sees and recognizes no elements of danger to the slave system. No; it is not on account of any or all of these (he would have us believe) that slavery is brought into a critical condition, and is approaching her end. 'Opinion takes too much credit to itself' when it claims this, when it points to its scores of public journals, its National Eras, its New York Tribunes, its 'Uncle Toms,' its ever varying literature, its popular Conventions, discussions, debates and investigations, as instrumentalities adapted to the overthrow of slavery, and affording just cause of anxiety, in the conservators of the peculiar institution. No, no. All this has little or nothing to do with the distressful anxieties of the slaveholders, at least it does not furnish the real cause of the present 'unpromising' condition of the slave system. That cause is to be found in the higher prices of cotton, the increased profitableness of slave labor, and the consequent rise of the price of negroes, since 1776, from \$50 to \$500. The real perils of the slave system, according to the new philosophy, are to be found just here! Let the value of cotton and negroes be doubled, once or twice more, and slavery would be overthrown!

Such is the wisdom of political economy when it derides "Theology and Ethics," when it ignores God and Humanity, and bases itself upon dollars and dimes, when it allies itself to revenues and cotton, and parts company with conscience and common sense.

If Pennsylvania must dictate to the friends of freedom their platforms, and if Pennsylvania is to be controlled by philosophers like these, the day of peaceful deliverance will be distant. Another thought suggests itself in this connexion. While reading the editorial in the Era of Aug. 6, it occurred to us that the writer's views might foreshadow the next phase of diluted, indirect, useless political action against the slave power, after the waning issues of "Free Kansas" and of "Non Extension" shall have faded from the canvass. Rather than come up, like men, to the one only manly issue of *National Abolition*, who knows, (thought we,) but Mr. Carey's panacea of a high tariff to raise the price of cotton, negroes, and slave plantations, as a means of killing out slavery, may not be the very next humbug with which to sponge up the sympathies and efforts of the friends of freedom? (We remembered that the N. Y. Tribune, so lately as 1854, expressed its prefer-

ence for a rally on the one issue of a protective tariff, if the whig party could be kept together, leaving slavery and anti-slavery out of the political platform, and holding it as an open question, to be discussed morally and economically, pro and con, without its being made the test of party.)

And behold! Sooner than we expected, the National Era of 13th August, in an editorial apparently from the same pen, approvingly hints, if we understand him, at this very thing. Men, he says, "must consult necessary expediency"—they "may not continue to fight issues which are not in present array." "If it is settled irrevocably that Utah and New Mexico shall come into the Union without anti-slavery restriction"—"the effort of the anti-slavery power will only be wasted by worrying itself with the view of reversing or evading it." What then does the writer propose, as the next move? The abolition of slavery? Not exactly! Hear him.

"By the Constitution, we could not abolish slavery in the States; by policy we can, and in justice we may. By the new rule of Federal legislation and of Judicial construction, we cannot prohibit Slavery in the Territories, but it is in our power to exclude it in fact.

It is, indeed, absurd to cling to the notion that there is no power but that of Congress to settle the social and economical destiny of the Republic, and that this power must be exerted in direct legislation upon the allowance or prohibition of Slavery in the common domain. Congress has a score of other and undisputed capabilities for influencing the result, and of much greater potency in themselves."

That is—in plain English—let the "anti-slavery power" prepare to give up the issues of prohibition, exclusion, non-extension, and abolition altogether, and go at work in that better way of rooting out slavery by high tariffs which shall raise the price of cotton, of negroes, and of plantations, making slavery so profitable that the slaveholders can cling to the system no longer, but be driven by "policy" and the "logic of the ledger" to set their slaves free!—The remainder of his article, (for which we have not room) shows this to be the writer's meaning.

The National Era did not, formerly, incline to favor a protective tariff. Will its dread of national abolition and "consolidation" drive it to take that ground? And in doing this, will it give up further attempts to prevent the extension of slavery, by action of Congress? We shall see.

THE PROSPECTS OF KANSAS,

Have not improved since our last issue. Within the month past there have appeared unequivocal signs of a determination, on the part of Mr. Buchanan's administration and of Gov. Walker, to enforce the Border Ruffian legislation of Kansas. The Federal troops, temporarily withdrawn from before Lawrence, for expected service (as was said) against the Indians, have been returned again, to their former position. New arrests of Free State men have been wantonly and insultingly made, and more are in prospect. Free State men, imprisoned last year, and released on a professed entrance of *nolle prosequi* (prosecution withdrawn,) are arrested again, on the old charge, and the fact of their having been discharged is denied. Preparations are making for a collection of the bogus taxes. Gov. Walker explains away his

recent assurances, so fully given, that the new Constitution should be submitted to the vote for acceptance or rejection, of all the bona fide inhabitants of Kansas. Extensive preparations are making by the slaveholders of Missouri, to re-enter the Territory, armed, on that occasion, to take possession of the polls, as formerly, and carry the election by force of arms. The bogus Territorial Court, decides, in advance, that no one can vote on the Constitution who has not paid the bogus taxes. And the most important official posts in the Territory are filled with the most bitter and violent enemies of freedom, and Free State men.

Under these circumstances there seems but the two alternatives of peaceful submission and subjugation on the one hand, and of open revolt on the other. The Free State men, if thorough-going Quakers, might be expected to take the former course. They might submit, under protest, to the seizure of their property for taxes, and the sale of it, in a community a large majority of whom are Free State men, would be an unpopular and not very brisk business. And they might relinquish their plan of voting, in October or November, on the question of adopting the Constitution, and let the slaveocrats have it all in their own way, as they did at the recent election of delegates to the Convention. This would prevent any one from claiming that the Constitution had been adopted by the people, and there could be no pretense that they had had any fair opportunity for peaceable voting. To us, with our pacific views, and at this distance, we confess it appears to us that this would be the wisest course for them to pursue, the course most likely, in the end, to make Kansas a free State, and, at the same time, preserve the country from civil war. But we have little expectation that this course will be pursued. The people of Kansas are not Quakers, any more than are the people of New York and New England. With few exceptions, they have no conscientious scruples against fighting for their rights. Whether or no the Anglo Saxon race, as some think, have passed the period of fighting for *liberty*, we consider a grave question. They are now a commercial, not an enthusiastic nor a metaphysical people. We think they have not yet passed the period of fighting for *property*, and there is much property at stake in Kansas. The hazards of property in a civil war, plead for peace, but will there not be greater hazards, in their view, of a final subjugation, reducing their property to the Slave State prices? The probabilities of resistance seem to preponderate. And this accords with our most reliable intelligence. A correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, as copied into the N. Y. Times of August 14th says,—

"The most extensive and formidable military organization, that ever existed in a Territory of the United States, has been formed, within the last three weeks, in Kansas. Its purpose is to protect the ballot-box at the October election, and forever afterwards, until our admission into the Union as a Free State. If, by fraud and bribery, Kansas is admitted as a slave State, this organization will not be dissolved.

The Free State men have an overwhelming majority in Kansas, and if their rights are not respected, a civil war will be instantly inaugurated. I speak from knowledge, not from belief. Over five thousand men have already been enrolled, and five thousand more, at the lowest calculation, will be in military order before October next. If Missouri attempts to interfere with Kansas affairs, the

slaves of the Platte Region will be liberated at the point of the bayonet. Buchanan, Douglas, Atchison & Co., will find that they will rouse up a tiger, instead of a worm, if they attempt to force their favorite organized crime on the people here. The Free State men are too strong now to care for the troops of Missouri either."

We have private information, from a high source, to the same effect, and still further. The movement will not stop in Missouri. The war, if it begins, will run through the slave States. It will be a war of revolution, and make other work for the administration, besides subduing Kansas. It will probably embroil the whole nation. If Christians have any prayers to offer, for peace, and for deliverance from military despotism, now is the time to offer them. If they have any work to do, to avert national destruction, now is the time for it.

Even the *N. Y. Times* (Aug. 26,) is driven into an admission that President Buchanan appears to have been driven by pro slavery clamor into a compliance with the ultra Southern demands—that "the *Union*" vindicates him from the "imputation of wishing to make Kansas a free state"—that General Walker has changed his tone on the subject of voting on the Constitution—that he has handed over to the Territorial Legislature (bogus) the apportionment which he should have made himself—that the old executive machinery of indictments and arrests have been revived—and that "all these things indicate a bending to the Southern storm, and have infused corresponding encouragement and hope into the breasts of Atchinson, and his Blue Lodge Confederates." The "Times" is led from this to anticipate for the administration, and Gov. Walker, "a blasting condemnation, at the hands of the people of the Northern and Western States"—if they proceed in this manner.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1857.

LETTERS for the Editor of the Radical Abolitionist, or the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to them at the Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beekman st., New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

TAKE NOTICE, that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

NOTICE.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE

AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY

will be held at Syracuse N. Y. on Tuesday and Wednesday, September 29th, and 30th, 1857, commencing at 2 P. M. on Tuesday, and continuing until Wednesday Evening. The Annual Report and Treasurer's Report will be presented, Officers elected, Resolutions discussed, and measures proposed for enlarged operations. A general attendance of the friends of *National Abolition*, from all parts of the country, is earnestly requested.

The signs of the times, the condition of the country, the perils of freedom, the abominations of slavery, the strides of the Slave Power, the groans of the oppressed millions, the failure of

past measures excluding national abolition, and the impending judgments of Heaven, unitedly call for a rally of true men, in such a spirit, and in such numbers, as shall befit the exigencies of the cause.

It is expected that the meeting will convene in the City Hall.

WILLIAM GOODELL,
S. S. JOCELYN,
JAMES McCUNE SMITH,
WILLIAM E. WHITING,
Editors please copy

Committee

of

Arrangements,

OUR ANNUAL MEETING.

It will be seen from the above notice that our Annual Meeting is to be held at SYRACUSE, N. Y., the two last days of September, and immediately preceding the Annual Celebration, at the same place, of the Jerry Rescue.

We had intended to issue the notice a longer time before the meeting, but the time and place could not be determined upon sooner. With due attention, on the part of our friends, the notice may be sufficiently circulated.

It is of great importance to our cause that there should be, on this occasion, a general and prompt attendance of Radical Abolitionists from all parts of the country. The times are favorable for enlarging the operations of the Society, and the plans that may be presented will need the united wisdom and enterprise of the Society for consideration and completion.

The aspect of affairs not only in Kansas, but in the country generally, indicate more strongly than ever the pressing necessity of a NATIONAL ABOLITION OF SLAVERY. All other plans are proving to be good for nothing. The enterprise of "limitation," by congressional action, is an acknowledged failure, and is already in process of abandonment by those whose aims do not include the direct and general abolition of slavery. The decision of the Dred Scott case is felt to have interposed a veto in advance, against all federal action for the restriction or limitation of slavery, and there can be no reasonable doubt that that obstacle will be insurmountable by any other process than by that which shall remove slavery itself. From an article commencing on our first page, it will be seen that even the National Era is apprehensive of this, and, despairing of any Congressional exclusion of New Mexico and Utah as slave States, should slavery be carried there, is groping after some other method of operating against slavery. The silence of such papers as the New York Tribune, in respect to future prospects and plans of operation, is another significant sign of the times. It can eloquently descant upon the perils of freedom under the rule of the Sham Democracy, but it fails to enlighten us upon the *modus operandi* of relief, from a Republicanism that, under the Dred Scott decision, is laboring against slavery extension, with a pledge to let slavery alone in the citadel of its empire!

But this is not all. The Dred Scott decision does more than this. In its principle, and in its intended operation, it goes to the repudiation of the laws prohibiting the African slave trade. It is thus understood at the South. Already, measures have been taken in Savannah to import slaves in defiance of the prohibitory law, and anticipating, confidently, a decision agains

RADICAL ABOLITIONIST.

its validity, by the Supreme Court. Our Republican Editors and Politicians see this, and are silent!—*Why?* Because *their* platform, so far from furnishing them with any means, or weapons, or standing place, with or upon which to contend against this new aggression, furnishes all the standing place, means and weapons that even the slave traders themselves could desire, to push forward the aggression. Admitting the Constitutional right of the slave states to maintain slavery, their constitutional right to import slaves cannot successfully be contended against. The admission that Congress cannot abolish slavery in the States is a virtual admission that Congress cannot prevent the States from importing slaves. Such, at least, will be the logic of the Supreme Court. Such, too, will ultimately be the decision of Congress, if called to act on the question, or, at least, it will bow in submission to the Supreme Court. And such, too, will be the decision, or the submission, of the majority of the people, willingly, or unwillingly, if they are still to be drugged with the dogma that Congress cannot interfere with slavery in the States. We run *no* possible hazard, in predicting this. We predict it on the same ground upon which we predicted in 1854; first, that the Missouri Compromise would be repealed; second, that it would never be restored; third, that Congress would never prohibit the introduction of slavery into Kansas; fourth, that no majority of the people could be rallied to reverse the decision of Congress. The prospects of such a rally are not half as good now as they were twelve months ago, when the fate of Kansas seemed suspended on that measure, and before the Dred Scott decision had been interposed against it. Just as certainly as neither Congress nor the people could prohibit slavery in Kansas, while admitting its constitutional right in the States, just so certainly neither Congress nor the people can maintain the prohibitory law against the slave trade, while making that insane and guilty admission. Like causes produce like effects. Moral and political causes and effects are as irrevocably subject to fixed laws, as are physical cause and effect. The same cause that repealed the Missouri restriction, and declared it unconstitutional, will repeal the law interdicting the slave trade, or pronounce it unconstitutional. And the barrier that could not prevent the former aggression can never prevent the latter.

The restoration of the African slave trade, under sanction of the Federal Government, is as rationally certain as the rising of to-morrow's sun, unless prevented—either by a revolution, or by a *national abolition of slavery* in the States. The prediction will seem extravagant to many, now. But not more so than did our similar predictions, in 1854 and onward, which have all become history.

Such, then, are the solemn circumstances in which the Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY is to be held, the *only Society* that proposes a national abolition of slavery. Shall we prepare to go forward? Shall we come up, manfully, to the work? Will we come together, devise liberal things, and by liberal things stand? Or, will we go to our farms and our merchandise—let the slave groan in his chains—let the country take care of itself—and leave

our liberties and the destinies of posterity at the disposal of political gamblers and aspirants? Which will we do?

THE SLAVE TRADE.

The following Resolutions were presented in the Southern Commercial Convention in Tennessee, Aug. 11th.

Resolved, That the slave trade being a transfer of slaves from one master to another, is not strictly wrong, and is not, therefore, a proper subject of prohibition; and that the attempt to suppress the African slave trade having resulted in more evil than good, the South ought not to be taxed to sustain a police navy for its suppression.

Resolved, That we recognise in the domestic institution of the South that form of government best adapted to the African race, most conducive to the permanency of our institutions and the great commercial interests of the world; and as such it is the duty of Christians and patriots to sustain them.

These resolutions were supported by the same course of reasoning that has been employed by our Northern Divines in support of slavery. The writings of Dr. Hodge, Prof. Stuart, Pres. Fisk, Bishop Hedding, Dr. Spring and Dr. Lord, are producing their legitimate results. Among other arguments, the Christianizing influences of slavery upon the African race were conspicuously brought forward and dwelt upon with much unction. One of the speakers, Mr. L. J. Gogerty, said—

'Were they [the Christians of the North] as men who were anxious to see the Christian religion diffused into every region of the earth, to go in opposition to the greatest missionary enterprise that the sun ever shone upon, from any such consideration as they had referred to? They sent their missionaries to and fro, and what did they do? Why, comparatively nothing. Look at your missionaries here, and see what has been the result of their exertions. He maintained that the African slave trade, so far from being an evil, did more than the greatest missionary enterprise in the cause of religion and civilization. (Applause.)'

The gentleman's argument was a fair sequel to the claim so often made, by even Northern Ministers, on behalf of their 'Southern brethren,' that they hold their slaves in order to christianize and civilize them. If the argument be good in favor of slaveholding, it is equally good in favor of the slave trade. It is well that the plea is now being pushed to its legitimate results. But some of our pro-slavery clergy will not probably relish the disparaging comparison between their own 'missionary enterprise' and the slave trade! Yet we can hardly forbear the remark, that if slavery be a Christian institution, or indeed compatible with Christianity, the slave trader has one advantage over them in the argument. He conducts his missionary operations on a magnificent scale, or would do so, if we would only repeal the act for hanging his Missionaries. And why should they be hanged, while the slaveholders are welcomed to the communion table?

The resolutions in favor of re-opening the African slave trade were opposed by some, in the convention, as impolitic, and were deferred as premature. But a preliminary measure was taken, in the adoption of a Resolution demanding the termination of that clause of our treaty with Great Britain which binds us to assist in putting down the slave trade, on the African coast.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention the eighth article of the treaty of Washington, ratified on the 10th, of November, 1842, ought to be annulled, under the provision of the first clause of the eleventh article of said treaty.

Resolved, That a copy of the above resolution be sent, by the President of this Convention, to

the senators and representative in Congress from each state here presented, with the request that it be laid before the legislatures of their respective states for their consideration.

The vote on its adoption stood 64 to 27. The Convention had previously voted down an amendment offered by Mr. Snead, of Tennessee, to the effect that in their opinion, it was 'contrary to the settled policy of the country' to repeal the laws prohibitory of the African 'slave trade.' This declaration received but forty votes.

Here we have, then, (says the N. Y. Evening Post) a distinct expression of a settled purpose on the part of this Convention, and of the people they represent, to make a revival of the African slave trade a cardinal question of southern policy. By it they purpose to test the soundness of their representatives in Congress, and whatever influence they can exert, either through state or national channels, is pledged to the repeal of all restrictions upon the commerce in human beings

THE NEXT 'ISSUE.'—What shall be 'the issue' at the next Presidential canvass? The issue of 'No more slave States' may be considered as already abandoned. The Pittsburg Convention of 1856 declined giving it a place in their Platform, though some of the speakers at the Republican meetings, afterwards, made a show of holding it up as an issue, before the people. The Dred Scott decision was designed to put a veto, in advance, upon the resuscitation of that issue, and the appearance now is, that the effort is likely to be successful, so far as the platforms of aspiring politicians are concerned. They must have something more 'available' in the eyes of the people. The issue of 'Free Kansas' seems to promise little better for their purposes. The fate of Kansas is to be sooner settled and in some other manner than by a Presidential election. What issue then remains, short of a National abolition of slavery in the States? The National Era, as will be seen by an article commencing on our first page, is already taking time by the fore lock, and feeling the public pulse in favor of an issue based on the hopeful project of extinguishing slavery by making it more profitable to the slaveholder. This is certainly a bold move. Like the Colonization Society, and like the late Whig party, it has a Northern and a Southern phase, and can claim the support of both sides. Convince the slaveholder that it will raise the price of cotton and of slaves, and he will run the risk of its abolishing slavery. Convince the abolitionists and Free-Soilers that it will abolish slavery, without 'consolidation,' and they, too, will come into the measure, and we shall have Gov. Wise, and Gov. Seward in the same party, that is, if they and their respective friends can be wheedled into it—which seems doubtful.

What other issue, short of National abolition, can be thought of? Any new form of pro-slavery aggression would indeed furnish an issue, such as the repeal of the statute forbidding the African slave-trade. But any such issue would inevitably share the fate of its predecessors, and be decided in favor of the slaveholders, if their opponents should meet them, as hitherto, on a platform pledging themselves to let slavery alone in the States. Already the Northern wing of the Democratic party is in a course of preparation for uniting with the Southern wing, on that ground. Concede to them that slaveholding in the old States has a right to Constitutional tolerance and protection, and the same logic that gave them the victory on the issue of the Nebraska bill will give them the victory on the African slave-trade bill. The people will never be made to see that the slaveholders have no

recent assurances, so fully given, that the new Constitution should be submitted to the vote for acceptance or rejection, of all the bona fide inhabitants of Kansas. Extensive preparations are making by the slaveholders of Missouri, to re-enter the Territory, armed, on that occasion, to take possession of the polls, as formerly, and carry the election by force of arms. The bogus Territorial Court, decides, in advance, that no one can vote on the Constitution who has not paid the bogus taxes. And the most important official posts in the Territory are filled with the most bitter and violent enemies of freedom, and Free State men.

Under these circumstances there seems but the two alternatives of peaceful submission and subjugation on the one hand, and of open revolt on the other. The Free State men, if thorough-going Quakers, might be expected to take the former course. They might submit, under protest, to the seizure of their property for taxes, and the sale of it, in a community a large majority of whom are Free State men, would be an unpopular and not very brisk business. And they might relinquish their plan of voting, in October or November, on the question of adopting the Constitution, and let the slaveocrats have it all in their own way, as they did at the recent election of delegates to the Convention. This would prevent any one from claiming that the Constitution had been adopted by the people, and there could be no pretense that they had had any fair opportunity for peaceable voting. To us, with our pacific views, and at this distance, we confess it appears to us that this would be the wisest course for them to pursue, the course most likely, in the end, to make Kansas a free State, and, at the same time, preserve the country from civil war. But we have little expectation that this course will be pursued. The people of Kansas are not Quakers, any more than are the people of New York and New England. With few exceptions, they have no conscientious scruples against fighting for their rights. Whether or no the Anglo Saxon race, as some think, have passed the period of fighting for *liberty*, we consider a grave question. They are now a commercial, not an enthusiastic nor a metaphysical people. We think they have not yet passed the period of fighting for *property*, and there is much property at stake in Kansas. The hazards of property in a civil war, plead for peace, but will there not be greater hazards, in their view, of a final subjugation, reducing their property to the Slave State prices? The probabilities of resistance seem to preponderate. And this accords with our most reliable intelligence. A correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, as copied into the N. Y. Times of August 14th says,—

"The most extensive and formidable military organization, that ever existed in a Territory of the United States, has been formed, within the last three weeks, in Kansas. Its purpose is to protect the ballot-box at the October election, and forever afterwards, until our admission into the Union as a Free State. If, by fraud and bribery, Kansas is admitted as a slave State, this organization will not be dissolved.

The Free State men have an overwhelming majority in Kansas, and if their rights are not respected, a civil war will be instantly inaugurated. I speak from knowledge, not from belief. Over five thousand men have already been enrolled, and five thousand more, at the lowest calculation, will be in military order before October next. If Missouri attempts to interfere with Kansas affairs, the

slaves of the Platte Region will be liberated at the point of the bayonet. Buchanan, Douglas, Atchison & Co., will find that they will rouse up a tiger, instead of a worm, if they attempt to force their favorite organized crime on the people here. The Free State men are too strong now to care for the troops or Missouri either."

We have private information, from a high source, to the same effect, and still further. The movement will not stop in Missouri. The war, if it begins, will run through the slave States. It will be a war of revolution, and make other work for the administration, besides subduing Kansas. It will probably embroil the whole nation. If Christians have any prayers to offer, for peace, and for deliverance from military despotism, now is the time to offer them. If they have any work to do, to avert national destruction, now is the time for it.

Even the *N. Y. Times* (Aug. 26,) is driven into an admission that President Buchanan appears to have been driven by pro slavery clamor into a compliance with the ultra Southern demands—that "the *Union*" vindicates him from the "imputation of wishing to make Kansas a free state"—that General Walker has changed his tone on the subject of voting on the Constitution—that he has handed over to the Territorial Legislature (bogus) the apportionment which he should have made himself—that the old executive machinery of indictments and arrests have been revived—and that "all these things indicate a bending to the Southern storm, and have infused corresponding encouragement and hope into the breasts of Atchinson, and his Blue Lodge Confederates." The "Times" is led from this to anticipate for the administration, and Gov. Walker, "a blasting condemnation, at the hands of the people of the Northern and Western States"—if they proceed in this manner.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1857.

LETTERS for the Editor of the Radical Abolitionist, or the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to them at the Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beckman st., New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

TAKE NOTICE, that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

NOTICE.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE

AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY

will be held at Syracuse N. Y. on Tuesday and Wednesday, September 29th, and 30th, 1857, commencing at 2 P. M. on Tuesday, and continuing until Wednesday Evening. The Annual Report and Treasurer's Report will be presented, Officers elected, Resolutions discussed, and measures proposed for enlarged operations. A general attendance of the friends of *National Abolition*, from all parts of the country, is earnestly requested.

The signs of the times, the condition of the country, the perils of freedom, the abominations of slavery, the strides of the Slave Power, the groans of the oppressed millions, the failure of

past measures excluding national abolition, and the impending judgments of Heaven, unitedly call for a rally of true men, in such a spirit, and in such numbers, as shall befit the exigencies of the cause.

It is expected that the meeting will convene in the City Hall.

WILLIAM GOODELL,
S. S. JOCELYN,
JAMES MCCUNE SMITH,
WILLIAM E. WHITING,
Editors please copy

Committee
of
Arrangements,

OUR ANNUAL MEETING.

It will be seen from the above notice that our Annual Meeting is to be held at SYRACUSE, N. Y., the two last days of September, and immediately preceding the Annual Celebration, at the same place, of the Jerry Rescue.

We had intended to issue the notice a longer time before the meeting, but the time and place could not be determined upon sooner. With due attention, on the part of our friends, the notice may be sufficiently circulated.

It is of great importance to our cause that there should be, on this occasion, a general and prompt attendance of Radical Abolitionists from all parts of the country. The times are favorable for enlarging the operations of the Society, and the plans that may be presented will need the united wisdom and enterprise of the Society for consideration and completion.

The aspect of affairs not only in Kansas, but in the country generally, indicate more strongly than ever the pressing necessity of a NATIONAL ABOLITION OF SLAVERY. All other plans are proving to be good for nothing. The enterprise of "limitation," by congressional action, is an acknowledged failure, and is already in process of abandonment by those whose aims do not include the direct and general abolition of slavery. The decision of the Dred Scott case is felt to have interposed a veto in advance, against all federal action for the restriction or limitation of slavery, and there can be no reasonable doubt that that obstacle will be insurmountable by any other process than by that which shall remove slavery itself. From an article commencing on our first page, it will be seen that even the National Era is apprehensive of this, and, despairing of any Congressional exclusion of New Mexico and Utah as slave States, should slavery be carried there, is groping after some other method of operating against slavery. The silence of such papers as the New York Tribune, in respect to future prospects and plans of operation, is another significant sign of the times. It can eloquently descant upon the perils of freedom under the rule of the Sham Democracy, but it fails to enlighten us upon the *modus operandi* of relief, from a Republicanism that, under the Dred Scott decision, is laboring against slavery extension, with a pledge to let slavery alone in the citadel of its empire!

But this is not all. The Dred Scott decision does more than this. In its principle, and in its intended operation, it goes to the repudiation of the laws prohibiting the African slave trade. It is thus understood at the South. Already, measures have been taken in Savannah to import slaves in defiance of the prohibitory law, and anticipating, confidently, a decision agains

its validity, by the Supreme Court. Our Republican Editors and Politicians see this, and are silent!—*Why?* Because *their* platform, so far from furnishing them with any means, or weapons, or standing place, with or upon which to contend against this new aggression, furnishes all the standing place, means and weapons that even the slave traders themselves could desire, to push forward the aggression. Admitting the Constitutional right of the slave states to maintain slavery, their constitutional right to import slaves cannot successfully be contended against. The admission that Congress cannot abolish slavery in the States is a virtual admission that Congress cannot prevent the States from importing slaves. Such, at least, will be the logic of the Supreme Court. Such, too, will ultimately be the decision of Congress, if called to act on the question, or, at least, it will bow in submission to the Supreme Court. And such, too, will be the decision, or the submission, of the majority of the people, willingly, or unwillingly, if they are still to be drugged with the dogma that Congress cannot interfere with slavery in the States. We run *no* possible hazard, in predicting this. We predict it on the same ground upon which we predicted in 1854; first, that the Missouri Compromise would be repealed; second, that it would never be restored; third, that Congress would never prohibit the introduction of slavery into Kansas; fourth, that no majority of the people could be rallied to reverse the decision of Congress. The prospects of such a rally are not half as good now as they were twelve months ago, when the fate of Kansas seemed suspended on that measure, and before the Dred Scott decision had been interposed against it. Just as certainly as neither Congress nor the people could prohibit slavery in Kansas, while admitting its constitutional right in the States, just so certainly neither Congress nor the people can maintain the prohibitory law against the slave trade, while making that insane and guilty admission. Like causes produce like effects. Moral and political causes and effects are as irrevocably subject to fixed laws, as are physical cause and effect. The same cause that repealed the Missouri restriction, and declared it unconstitutional, will repeal the law interdicting the slave trade, or pronounce it unconstitutional. And the barrier that could not prevent the former aggression can never prevent the latter.

The restoration of the African slave trade, under sanction of the Federal Government, is as rationally certain as the rising of to-morrow's sun, unless prevented—either by a revolution, or by a *national abolition of slavery* in the States. The prediction will seem extravagant to many, now. But not more so than did our similar predictions, in 1854 and onward, which have all become history.

Such, then, are the solemn circumstances in which the Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY is to be held, the *only Society* that proposes a national abolition of slavery. Shall we prepare to go forward? Shall we come up, manfully, to the work? Will we come together, devise liberal things, and by liberal things stand? Or, will we go to our farms and our merchandise—let the slave groan in his chains—let the country take care of itself—and leave

our liberties and the destinies of posterity at the disposal of political gamblers and aspirants? Which will we do?

THE SLAVE TRADE.

The following Resolutions were presented in the Southern Commercial Convention in Tennessee, Aug. 11th.

Resolved, That the slave trade being a transfer of slaves from one master to another, is not strictly wrong, and is not, therefore, a proper subject of prohibition; and that the attempt to suppress the African slave trade having resulted in more evil than good, the South ought not to be taxed to sustain a police navy for its suppression.

Resolved, That we recognise in the domestic institution of the South that form of government best adapted to the African race, most conducive to the permanency of our institutions and the great commercial interests of the world; and as such it is the duty of Christians and patriots to sustain them.

These resolutions were supported by the same course of reasoning that has been employed by our Northern Divines in support of slavery. The writings of Dr. Hodge, Prof. Stuart, Pres. Fisk, Bishop Hedding, Dr. Spring and Dr. Lord, are producing their legitimate results. Among other arguments, the Christianizing influences of slavery upon the African race were conspicuously brought forward and dwelt upon with much unction. One of the speakers, Mr. L. J. Gogerty, said—

'Were they [the Christians of the North] as men who were anxious to see the Christian religion diffused into every region of the earth, to go in opposition to the greatest missionary enterprise that the sun ever shone upon, from any such consideration as they had referred to? They sent their missionaries to and fro, and what did they do? Why, comparatively nothing. Look at your missionaries here, and see what has been the result of their exertions. He maintained that the African slave trade, so far from being an evil, did more than the greatest missionary enterprise in the cause of religion and civilization. (Applause.)'

The gentleman's argument was a fair sequel to the claim so often made, by even Northern Ministers, on behalf of their 'Southern brethren,' that they hold their slaves in order to christianize and civilize them. If the argument be good in favor of slaveholding, it is equally good in favor of the slave trade. It is well that the plea is now being pushed to its legitimate results. But some of our pro-slavery clergy will not probably relish the disparaging comparison between their own 'missionary enterprise' and the slave trade! Yet we can hardly forbear the remark, that if slavery be a Christian institution, or indeed compatible with Christianity, the slave trader has one advantage over them in the argument. He conducts his missionary operations on a magnificent scale, or would do so, if we would only repeal the act for hanging his Missionaries. And why should they be hanged, while the slaveholders are welcomed to the communion table?

The resolutions in favor of re-opening the African slave trade were opposed by some, in the convention, as impolitic, and were deferred as premature. But a preliminary measure was taken, in the adoption of a Resolution demanding the termination of that clause of our treaty with Great Britain which binds us to assist in putting down the slave trade, on the African coast.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention the eighth article of the treaty of Washington, ratified on the 10th, of November, 1842, ought to be annulled, under the provision of the first clause of the eleventh article of said treaty.

Resolved, That a copy of the above resolution be sent, by the President of this Convention, to

the senators and representative in Congress from each state here presented, with the request that it be laid before the legislatures of their respective states for their consideration.

The vote on its adoption stood 64 to 27. The Convention had previously voted down an amendment offered by Mr. Sneed, of Tennessee, to the effect that in their opinion, it was 'contrary to the settled policy of the country' to repeal the laws prohibitory of the African 'slave trade.' This declaration received but forty votes.

Here we have, then, (says the N. Y. Evening Post) a distinct expression of a settled purpose on the part of this Convention, and of the people they represent, to make a revival of the African slave trade a cardinal question of southern policy. By it they purpose to test the soundness of their representatives in Congress, and whatever influence they can exert, either through state or national channels, is pledged to the repeal of all restrictions upon the commerce in human beings

THE NEXT 'ISSUE.'—What shall be 'the issue' at the next Presidential canvass? The issue of 'No more slave States' may be considered as already abandoned. The Pittsburg Convention of 1856 declined giving it a place in their Platform, though some of the speakers at the Republican meetings, afterwards, made a show of holding it up as an issue, before the people. The Dred Scott decision was designed to put a veto, in advance, upon the resuscitation of that issue, and the appearance now is, that the effort is likely to be successful, so far as the platforms of aspiring politicians are concerned. They must have something more 'available' in the eyes of the people. The issue of 'Free Kansas' seems to promise little better for their purposes. The fate of Kansas is to be sooner settled and in some other manner than by a Presidential election. What issue then remains, short of a National abolition of slavery in the States? The National Era, as will be seen by an article commencing on our first page, is already taking time by the fore lock, and feeling the public pulse in favor of an issue based on the hopeful project of extinguishing slavery by making it more profitable to the slaveholder. This is certainly a bold move. Like the Colonization Society, and like the late Whig party, it has a Northern and a Southern phase, and can claim the support of both sides. Convince the slaveholder that it will raise the price of cotton and of slaves, and he will run the risk of its abolishing slavery. Convince the abolitionists and Free-Soilers that it will abolish slavery, without 'consolidation,' and they, too, will come into the measure, and we shall have Gov. Wise, and Gov. Seward in the same party, that is, if they and their respective friends can be wheedled into it—which seems doubtful.

What other issue, short of National abolition, can be thought of? Any new form of pro-slavery aggression would indeed furnish an issue, such as the repeal of the statute forbidding the African slave-trade. But any such issue would inevitably share the fate of its predecessors, and be decided in favor of the slaveholders, if their opponents should meet them, as hitherto, on a platform pledging themselves to let slavery alone in the States. Already the Northern wing of the Democratic party is in a course of preparation for uniting with the Southern wing, on that ground. Concede to them that slaveholding in the old States has a right to Constitutional tolerance and protection, and the same logic that gave them the victory on the issue of the Nebraska bill will give them the victory on the African slave-trade bill. The people will never be made to see that the slaveholders have no

RADICAL ABOLITIONIST.

as good a right under the Constitution to import slaves as they have to hold them, as good a Constitutional right to import them, as to carry them into the Territories—and that the citizens in the Northern States have not as good a right to be protected by the Federal Government in such practices as the citizens of the Southern States have. That concession of the Constitutional right of slaveholding must forever be fatal to any political attempt to prevent the Federal Government from being the instrument and Slave of the Slave Power, in every possible aggression that it may inaugurate. The only possible way to prevent the pro-slavery party from welding the Federal Government to open and protect the African slave-trade, in all the States, is for the friends of freedom to wield it, for the extirpation of slavery, in all the States. No other 'issue' will be worth anything.

MOVEMENT IN VERMONT.

The following appeared in the Green Mountain Freeman of August 6.

Radical Abolitionists' Convention.—All those who believe and are ready to take the position that Slavery has no right, North nor South, but to die, and are disgusted at the brutal slave-driver, who construes his rights and liberties into the right to whip niggers and lynch abolitionists, are requested to meet at the Court House in Montpelier, on Wednesday, the 12th day of August, A. D., 1857, at ten o'clock, A. M., to nominate candidates for State Officers, to be supported the coming September election. Come all you that work, and are willing that others should, and say what you intend to carry out in practice. Come from every town in large numbers and nominate men for office who are not ashamed of the men that work, 'and earn their bread by the sweat of their brow.' Able speakers from abroad are expected."

BY REQUEST OF MANY.

What will the Radical Convention do?—Under this head the editor of the Green Mountain Freeman, in a leader of some length, advertises to the disposition shown by many in the Republican party to bring down the platform to that of the old Whig party in that State. To counteract this, the editor thinks, is the object of the Convention above notified. He says,

"These Radicals are not of the Garrison School, of 'Down with the Union!' No such thing. They contend that the Constitution affords ample power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, the slave traffic, and finally wherever it exists in the United States. This is our knowledge of those engaged in this Radical move."

The editor says further,

"No one can for a moment doubt the position of our excellent Governor upon the leading questions now at issue, viz.—Slavery and Intemperance. His radical views were early known to the people of the State, and too that those principles were learned from the School of William Goodell, Elizur Wright, and others of the founders of the old Liberty party, twenty years ago; and we have no intimation that he has ever retracted or compromised those principles in the least."

The editor therefore hopes that the Convention will content itself with discussing and reaffirming these Radical principles, and nominate the present incumbent of State offices. The article closes thus.

"Let the matter be discussed. Discussed in every possible manner and place. Agitate! agitate!! agitate!!!—resolving that our country shall have no peace—our eyelids no sleep, until we have secured safety to our Liberties, and Freedom to our oppressed brethren."

Since preparing the above, we have received the Green Mountain Freeman of August 20, containing the proceedings of the Convention, from which we extract the following.

State Radical Abolitionist Convention.—The Convention, pursuant to notice, met at the Court House in Montpelier, August 12, 1857, A. M.

Mr. Sampson called the Convention to order.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Prindle.

President, Lyman Prindle, of Waitsfield.

Vice-President, Seymour Allen, of Tunbridge.

Secretary, G. C. Sampson, of Northfield.

Committee on Resolutions, Messrs. Sampson, Allen of

Hinesburgh, Tucker of Tunbridge, Bucklin of Waitsfield, and Babbitt of Brookfield.

Nomination of State Officers referred to Convention in Committee of the whole in the afternoon.

Adjourned one hour.

Met pursuant to adjournment, when the Committee reported the following Platform and Resolutions, which were discussed by Messrs. Spaulding, Ballou, Burke, Prindle and Sampson, and adopted:

PLATFORM OF THE RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS OF VERMONT. ADOPTED IN STATE CONVENTION, AT MONTPELIER, AUGUST 12, 1857.

Whereas, The Republican Party, as well as the other political parties of the State and Nation, maintains that Slavery is lawful, and so the Pro-Slavery character of the United States Constitution—but proposes no amendment or alteration of that instrument to make it better—while it professes to be an anti-slavery party—thus presenting the absurd and impotent effort of acting against the very Constitution is so much reveres and lauds; and also disclaims all sympathy and fellowship with the views and aims of Abolitionists, constantly and emphatically repudiating and denouncing our sentiments, by saying, "we are inflexibly opposed to all interference with Slavery where it is," i. e. "in the States;" and whereas, we believe that Slavery has no rights—and can have none—neither by the Constitution nor laws of God, nature, State or Nation—any more than stealing and robbery—and whereas, the most that can be said of the Republican party, as to Slavery, is that it occupies a defensive position against the overshadowing evil: and whereas, this Republican party cherishes no sympathy for, nor extends any arm of deliverance to the black man who is down, but simply proposes to keep the white man on his feet:—In the name, and as the Representatives of Radical Abolitionists of Vermont, we feel constrained to dissent from that party, as well as the other parties of the State and Country; and therefore proceed to organize a party in Vermont upon the principles embodied in the following platform and resolutions, viz: Believing that neither the Declaration of Independence—the fundamental law of the land—nor the laws of nature, nor those of God nor man, either authorize or tolerate American Slavery, and that our political forefathers were neither knaves nor fools—so that when they said, in the name of the People of the United States. "We do ordain and establish this Constitution—to secure the *blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity*,"—they had sincerity and honesty enough to mean what they said, and were men of sufficient knowledge and skill to frame a Constitution that would accomplish the object they framed it for. We do therefore believe and maintain that the Constitution of the United States is not only *not* Pro-Slavery, but the *Magna Charta of Freedom* to all the inhabitants of the Country, without distinction of race, color, or occupation; therefore,

Resolved, That the interpretation, under which the Constitution of the United States is generally received and applied, is in harsh conflict with the Laws of God and humanity, the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and those principles of legal interpretation which obtain in the constitution of legal instruments generally.

2. Resolved, That Slavery can take nothing by *mere construction*, but must be excluded whenever or wherever the plainest and most unequivocal words are not used in its favor; that all doubtful and ambiguous words and phrases are therefore to be construed in favor of Liberty, hence, the United States Constitution, containing no explicit, unequivocal words or phrases in favor of slavery, but an abundance of both against it, whatever there may be in that instrument of doubtful import, cannot be construed to establish or sustain the odious Institution.

3. Resolved, That the protection of human beings, in the essential rights of our Common Humanity, is the first duty of Society, that Government is an institution of Society, and an ordinance of God for this very end, that allegiance is conditioned upon protection, hence in the nature of things, there can be no legitimate civil Government, however constricted or limited, which is not authorized and bound to secure to all human beings within its geographical limits, their natural, inalienable rights—"Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

4. Resolved, That American Slavery is the most atrocious violation of essential human rights, that, from the commencement of our national history, the nation and its Government have been responsible for its existence, that its tolerance is our great national sin, and its long continuance and growth render a national abolition of Slavery a national necessity, without which our national Freedom and existence cannot long be maintained.

5. Resolved, That we repudiate all compromises and mere expediencies in our efforts to resist and abolish American Slavery.

6. Resolved, That the enactment of the "Missouri Compromise" was wicked, as it assumed to grant right to Slavery south of 36°—30°. "Squatter Sovereignty" is wicked, as it assumed the right of the people to establish slavery where they choose, and, as we are opposed to the enactment of the latter, so are we to the re-enactment of the former.

7. Resolved, That there can be no more law for Slavery in the States, than in the Territories: nor any more in one State than in another, but Slavery is an outlaw everywhere.

8. Resolved, That the United States Supreme Court in their decision in the Dred Scott case, in denying the citizenship of the colored people and their right to protection by the Federal Government, has ignored the humanity of five millions of people, or one sixth part of the pop-

ulation of the Republic, and adopted principles, which, if carried out, would introduce and perpetuate Slavery in every free State in the Union, and that by denying the personality of the slaves, and their right to maintain a suit of the Federal Courts, if correct, has absolved the States from all obligations to regard them as belonging to that class of "persons" who are to be delivered up as owing service of labor.

9. Resolved, That the enactment of the law of 1856 (with the addition of 1854—5 and 6) known as "An Act to prevent the Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors for the purpose of drinking," and its subsequent enforcement, has been of vast pecuniary, social, and moral benefit to the people of Vermont, and the continuance and ardent support, and execution of that law is demanded by the public welfare and the public sentiment, and none but its firm and consistent supporters should be elected to office of trust and honor.

Referred the nomination of State Officers to a State Committee consisting of Messrs. Prindle of Waitsfield, Allen of Tunbridge, and Burke of Berlin.

The following Country Committee were appointed.

Washington County.—A. G. Burke, Joseph Poland, and Wm. M. Ellis.

Orange Co.—Messrs. I. Tucker, and B. W. Dwyer.

Lamoille Co.—E. E. Bingham.

Franklin Co.—John Whittemore, Lawrence Brainerd, and Asa O. Aldis.

Windham Co.—Wm. M. Pingry, and Col. A. Stimson.

Orleans Co.—Geo. Putnam.

Caledonia Co.—A. E. Judevine.

Chittenden Co.—John Allen, Austin Beecher, and John R. Forest.

Addison Co.—Nicholas Guindon, and William R. Standford.

Rutland Co.—R. R. Thrall, and A. Nicholson.

Bennington Co.—Joseph Eames, and Rev. Mr. Archibald.

Grand Isle Co.—Rev. O. G. Wheeler.

Essex Co.—David Hibbard.

ITEMS.

Large numbers of free blacks, from Louisiana, have removed into the State of Vera Cruz, where they have turned their attention to raising corn, and are represented as being very successful and prosperous.

The Springfield Republican says that a vessel has been sent out from Savannah for Africa, to bring home a cargo of slaves to that port, for the express purpose of testing the constitutionality of the laws prohibiting the slave trade. It is confidently believed that the principles of the Dred Scott decision, applied to such a case, will secure a decision against the validity of the prohibition.

It has been ascertained that the sugar crop in Mauritius, since emancipation, averages 150 per cent. more than during the last ten years of slave labor.

Rev. John D. Long, whose "Pictures of Slavery" were noticed, in our last number, has been notified to appear before the next Philadelphia Conference of the M. E. Church, to answer to charges for misrepresentations in the book, preferred against him by Rev. T. J. Quigley, a prominent member of that body, which is expected to purge itself from abolitionism.

A National Convention in favor of "Compensated Emancipation," on the plan of Elihu Burritt, is now holding at Cleveland, Ohio.

Movements are making for another Disunion Convention.

Rev. John G. Fee, of Kentucky, has been mobbed by the minions of slavery, and one of the meeting houses of the Christian Abolitionists has been burned by them. This reminds us that similar persecutions of the Missionaries in the British West Indies preceded the abolition of slavery there, and did much to hasten the measure. Even a Methodist camp meeting in Maryland has been recently disturbed on account of the customary privileges accorded to

colored people on such occasions. The crisis is coming.

The Political Abolitionist (Bryan, Ohio,) remarks that though the Republicans say the Radical Abolitionists are a mere handful, yet "that mere handful seems to engross their whole attention" in that region, insomuch that Democrats are lost sight of, there, entirely.

A letter from Ohio assures us that the anti-slavery exposition of the Constitution by Radical Abolitionists is gaining ground in that state, to the annoyance of the Garrisonians.

A Radical Abolition Convention was held at Georgetown, Defiance Co., Ohio, Aug. 15, at which James T. Guthrie, of Defiance Co., was nominated for State Senator, and Henry Williams, of Williams Co., for Representative. Measures were taken toward nominating a State Ticket, at an early day. W. A. Hunter, Editor of the Political Abolitionist, was Chairman of the Convention, and A. Ames, Secretary. The resolutions adopted were of an uncompromising character. We regret the lack of room for them.

Five colored messengers have been dismissed from the Patent Office, in Washington, in deference to the Dred Scott decision.

Professor Silliman and several prominent clergymen, having addressed President Buchanan, remonstrating "against the employment of United States troops to enforce the so called laws of Kansas," the President answers them, pointedly, assuring them that "by the help of God, he *will* enforce them." Perhaps "the help of God" will be found on the other side, and what will the President do, then?

Thomas Randall, the eloquent colored lecturer, is laboring successfully in Ohio. He is a Radical Abolitionist.

A Radical Abolition Convention is to be held at Montpelier, Williams Co., Ohio, the 12th of September.

It turns out that the Democratic party in Louisiana, for a number of years past, even since 1841, has been largely indebted for its success, to *the votes of colored citizens!* Last November, the Know-Nothings organized, to drive them from the polls, and Col. Hunter, the Democratic candidate, organized a band to defend them. The particulars are given in the Alexandria (La.) American, 8th August, as copied into the N. Y. Evening Post, of Aug. 21. What will our Democratic neighbors, who are endorsing the Dred Scott decision, in their conventions, say to this? And how does it agree with the recent dictum of the General Land Office, that colored persons, *not being citizens*, cannot pre-empt land? Can those vote who cannot purchase land? Falsehood "is fated to run crooked."

David Wilmot, the Republican Candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania, is making public speeches through the State, in which he repels the charge of being "an Abolitionist—a Radical," and says, "I hold that we have no power to meddle with slavery, where it already exists in the States."

The Atlantic Telegraph Cable got broken, because the engineer thought it prudent to check its natural course of running, instead of increasing the speed of his *vessel*;—just as our prudent politicians, with similar success, hold back public sentiment, instead of keeping pace with it.

OUR PRESENT CONSTITUTION, WHEN WAS IT FORMED?

We were under the impression that our present Constitution was drafted in 1787, and was adopted and went into operation in 1789. The Liberator, however, seems to be under a different impression. In a notice of the review of the Dred Scott decision which had appeared in the *Law Reporter* for June, the Liberator makes some important quotations from the review, showing that colored persons were regarded as citizens by Congress, in 1807, by President Jefferson, about the same time, or soon afterwards, by Mr. Madison, then Secretary of State, by Mr. Monroe, Minister of the United States in London, and by Gen. Jackson, in his proclamation at New Orleans, in 1814. Having made these quotations, the Liberator exclaims.

"This was the old state of things, but we are living under another government and *another Constitution*. The time has come for revolution and secession; and anything short of that is treason to the cause of freedom. Let the cry of 'No Union with Slaveholders!' ring in thunder-stones throughout the North!"

So then it seems that the Liberator has discovered that we are living under 'another Constitution,' formed since 1814. Of its exact date, its framers, and when, where, and by whom it was adopted, we are not informed. We hope the Liberator will not fail to furnish its readers with the particulars, and inform us where the important document can be obtained. When we write about the 'Constitution' we choose to have it before us, that we may be careful to speak of it, as it is—not as the slaveholders pretend that it is.—In all our writings on the Constitution we have had in mind the Constitution of 1787-9. Shall we understand that the Liberator and its supporters, including Wendell Phillips, when they speak of our Constitution, and call it 'a covenant with death and an agreement with hell' 'do not mean the Old Constitution of 1787-9 that was in force in 1807 and in 1814, but only that New Constitution that they have discovered, and that was framed and adopted afterwards? If it be so, it is no wonder that they differ from us so widely in their exposition of the Constitution. If it be so, we take it for granted that Mr. Phillips' 'United States Constitution and its pro-slavery compromises—from the Madison papers &c.,' is no longer to be used as the text book of that school of Constitutional expositors. Or are we to learn that 'the Madison papers' relate to that 'another Constitution' under which we are living, and which was made since 1814? Seriously, we are encouraged to find that the 'covenant with death and the agreement with hell' was not made by our fathers, and was not known by our national magnates, down to 1814. Until that 'another Constitution' can be hunted up and authenticated as a national act, a historical event, we shall venture to insist that an oath to support the Constitution is an oath to support the old fashioned constitution of 1787-9 which still stands upon the Statute Books, the original of which is to be seen in our National archives, and is still cited, article by article, and section by section, in our Federal courts, not that invisible new Constitution that finds expression in Dred Scott decisions, in open contradiction to the letter, the spirit, and the historical antecedents of 'the Constitution' commonly so called. 'The time for revolution and secession'—so far as the consti-

tution is concerned, will not have arrived, we think, until that 'another Constitution' shall have been produced and attested in due form.

One thing farther. The Liberator and its associates agree with other abolitionists in declaring the Dred Scott decision to be unconstitutional. How are we to understand this? Is it unconstitutional as being a violation of that 'another constitution' under which the Liberator says, we are now 'living'? If not, how shall Judge Taney be convicted, of a violation of the Constitution, we are now 'living' under? If otherwise, are we to understand that he is only guilty of having violated an old Constitution, which, at the time of his decision had become obsolete? How is it? Wendell Phillips is a Constitutional Lawyer. Can he not give us some light?

And still another question. Is that new Constitution of which the Liberator speaks, legally binding? If not, why is 'revolution' necessary in order to get rid of it? Why may we not elect a President and Congress who will 'secure the blessings of liberty' as the old Constitution provides?

DEATH OF TWO VETERAN ABOLITIONISTS.

The Green Mountain Freeman of 27th August records the deaths of two venerable citizens of Vermont, Rev. KIAH BAILEY of East Hardwick, and Hon. TITUS HUTCHINSON of Woodstock. Both of them were early abolitionists and both were of the Radical stamp, believing that slavery is a national sin and that the nation is responsible for its existence. Commencing life as they did, in the days of our Revolutionary fathers, they regarded them as friends of freedom and could not consent to expound our free institutions according to the dictum of modern slaveholders. And they regarded the law of God to be of higher authority than the statutes of men.

Rev. KIAH BAILEY died at the advanced age of 87 years. It was only in our last number that we published an extract of a letter we had received from him, when we took occasion to say of him that he was 'of the race of Bellamy, Edwards, Hopkins, and Emmons, whose orthodoxy and abolitionism went together'—a description which we find quoted in the Obituary notice of the 'Freeman,' which speaks of him as an 'old man eloquent'—an early friend of the oppressed, whose voice and pen was ever raised in their behalf'—adding, 'we shall miss his good counsel, and our readers will miss his able contributions.' A correspondent of the 'Freeman' describes him as always cheerful, social and kind.'

HON. TITUS HUTCHINSON, died aged 86.—We remember him as among the old men who came into the American Anti-slavery Society, in 1833, as being, already, an experienced abolitionist. He was one of the earliest to affirm the unconstitutionality of slavery. Says the 'Freeman,'—'He was amongst the number of the old Liberty guard, in this state, an early defender of Anti-slavery principles, and up to the time of his death his pen was ably wielded for the cause. Like Father Bailey, his counsel was prized and revered. We shall not soon find those to fill the place of these great and good men.'

The worst despots are those that affect to lack the power of protecting liberty.

